

# Tempe Municipal Court



## State of the Court

**Presented to Mayor and Council  
by Presiding Judge  
Louraine C. Arkfeld.**

January 2008



## INTRODUCTION

This is the fourteenth annual state of the court message presented to Mayor and Council. We have this tradition in order to provide you with the current status of the court by sharing information on our overall operations and performance including accomplishments, revenues, expenditures, and budget issues as well as our goals for this coming year. As always, we welcome any feedback from Mayor and Council about our work.

## ACCOMPLISHMENTS

### *Operational Effectiveness*

- The Court effectively maintained operations despite a 33 percent turnover rate in calendar year 2007.
- The Court has played an active role in the implementation of the City's new photo enforcement program, which is anticipated to increase filings and staff workload by up to 600 percent.
- This year marks the fourth full year of the Mental Health Court. There are currently 21 people participating in the program; three are homeless and four have co-occurring disorders. The Mental Health court offers a diversion option for the seriously mentally ill and aids that population in accessing various services in an effort to provide greater stability and lessen the likelihood of their committing new criminal offenses. While the primary mission of this program is to dispense justice while addressing the needs of this unique population, it has earned strong community support. All of the participants in Mental Health Court are represented by an attorney who volunteers her time. Community members have offered to provide clothing and other essential items to help contribute to successful program completion for our program participants.
- The Court is in compliance with all requirements of the Arizona Supreme Court's Minimum Accounting Standards Compliance Checklist again this year.
- The Court has received approval to create up to three Lead Court Service Specialists via competitive reclassification using existing CSS positions. These staff will provide needed day to day training and assistance to newer staff while providing the court with additional flexibility and providing staff with greater opportunities for career advancement.
- The Court and Customer service teams within the civil division of the Court have been “blended” with all employees being cross- trained to perform all tasks and functions.
- The criminal division of the court has actively participated in cross training of employees and revisions of procedures.
- The Court has revised and updated job descriptions for all employee positions.
- The Court has been highly invested in the City’s development of Business Continuity Plans. The Court has played a lead role in assisting other courts in developing disaster recovery plans.
- The Court established a Memorandum of Understanding with Scottsdale City Court so in the event of a disaster that results in the extended closure of either Court, the close proximity of these respective facilities make for reasonable alternative sites to conduct business on a temporary basis.

- In conjunction with its comprehensive Business Continuity Plan, the Court conducted an unannounced drill to utilize the manual work-around procedures that were developed as part of its business continuity plan.
- Court management completed National Incident Management System (NIMS) training certification and participated in the National Incident Disaster Exercise in October 2007.

### ***Technology Improvements***

- The Court purchased eight (8) electronic hand-held systems that that will be utilized by the Police Department's Traffic Enforcement Aides to issue electronic parking complaints. These units will be compatible with the Court's new Case Management System, and will be deployed when that system is implemented in September 2008. It is hoped that ultimately, hand-held technology can be utilized by all police officers to issue complaints, and thus all information can be electronically transmitted, which will largely eliminate redundant manual data entry by court specialists, lessen filing times and overall periods to adjudicate offenses, and reduce the likelihood of any errors.
- The Court has installed a new panic alarm system that allows for a more immediate and specific security response in the event of a security issue.

### ***Cost Effectiveness***

- In March of 2007, the Council approved an ordinance change allowing creation of a court commissioner position. This position was filled through the reclassification of one of our existing hearing officer positions. This new position has given the court flexibility to have the Commissioner work in the criminal division on a limited basis in addition to his regular job duties in the civil division while saving the costs of paying for a pro tem judge.
- In fiscal year 2007 the Court collected \$5,802,267 in revenues to the City. This figure was 1.5 percent higher than projections for the fiscal year. Overall, the Court received \$11,945,389 in payments in fiscal year 2007, which was \$496,047 more than the prior year; an increase of almost four percent. In addition to the City's General Fund, monies are disbursed to the state and funds designated by statute, to victims who are owed restitution and to collection agencies to offset the costs of holding those accountable who have previously been non-complaint.
- For every dollar spent on Court operations, the Court collects \$2.54, which is among the highest ratios of revenue to expenditure within Maricopa County.

### ***Customer Services***

- In addition to serving its hearing impaired customers, the Court is using its assistive listening devices to help interpreters more effectively communicate with Spanish speaking court users during various dockets.
- All Court staff has received training in the proper usage of court interpreters.
- The Court has worked collectively with Public Works and the Police Department to begin a project to overhaul and modernize the two existing elevators within the PD/Court Building. The Court provided the needed space to house the plumbing and equipment needed to power both elevators.

- With one full year in position, the Court Training Coordinator has ensured that the court made available a total of 1,466 hours of training for calendar year 2007 with 60 classes that were made available to employees.
- In order to measure job engagement and satisfaction, newly hired staff is surveyed and meet with the Court Training Coordinator informally on a monthly basis during their probationary period. This has proven to be successful in obtaining feedback and ensuring that their on-the-job training experience is positive and effective.
- Court employees receive training and have discussions on professionalism at monthly team meetings.

### ***Community Outreach***

- Court employees have participated in Tempe's Homeless Connect Program. Homeless individuals receive information on the court process and direction in resolving any outstanding court matters.
- In what has become a Tempe tradition, the Court invited all fifth through eighth grade students in the City of Tempe to participate in our annual Law Day contest. This year the Court hosted an art contest with the theme "Liberty Under Law: Empowering Youth, Assuring Democracy." There were over a hundred entries displayed in the City Council Chambers.
- Members of the court management team have made it a priority to provide ways to connect with other city departments and the Tempe community through committee involvement. This past year, management has served on the Executive Board for the Tempe Professional Development Club, the Deferred Compensation Executive Board, the Tempe Recruitment Outreach Committee, Tempe Leadership, The Tempe Committee on Homelessness, the Neighborhood Services Team, the Committee for Youth, Families and Community and the Oversight Board for the Tempe Learning Center.
- Members of the management team are active (and actively recruited) in boards, committees and commissions that serve Limited Jurisdiction, Superior and Supreme Courts. They include the Limited Jurisdiction Court Administrators' Association, the Supreme Court Code Standardization Committee, the Court Leadership Institute of Arizona, the Arizona Courts Association, the Commission on Victims in the Courts, the Committee on Limited Jurisdiction Courts, the Arizona Commission on Technology, the Technical Advisory Council, the Court Automation Coordinating Committee, and the Restorative Justice Resource Council.
- The Court continues to host presentations on issues of the law to groups such as Tempe Leadership and other community organizations.

## DISCUSSION

As always, the mission of this Court is to provide effective and efficient justice for our community. As a result, the first concern is to ensure appropriate staffing and efficient processes to handle the high volume of cases that continue to move through our Court. We have addressed this not only by advocating for additional positions but by improving the training that both new and continuing staff receive as well as looking for ways to increase the flexibility of tenured employees.

This past year, we have addressed our training and effectiveness goals in various ways. This is our first full year in which Frankie Valenzuela has served as our full-time training coordinator. The Council may or may not be aware that we are required by the Arizona Supreme Court to provide 16 hours of continuing education to all court staff – both judicial and non-judicial. As great believers in the impact of quality education, we have focused on developing strong in-house programs that not only meet the court mandate, but provide education that is both pertinent to our needs and easily accessible to our employees. One of the challenges in a small organization is keeping the most competent employees motivated when upward mobility is limited by the small number of management positions. To overcome this challenge we have also developed lead positions from existing Court Services Specialist positions. These individuals will not only be able to provide additional training and assistance to new staff, but they are also given an opportunity for career advancement that was previously not available. We believe this is a very important and needed benefit. We anticipate filling our first position within the month to assist new employees in working on photo enforcement cases. We operate with the second highest number of filings per non-judicial employee of any municipal court within Maricopa County, but with retention efforts that include improved training we are finally seeing reduction in our turnover rate. Although the rate for the entire year was still high at 33 percent, the really positive change has become apparent in the last six months; with a turnover rate that has fallen below 5 percent. This is a major accomplishment.

We made adjustments at the bench officer level as well. We currently have the highest number of filings per criminal judge for a municipal court in Maricopa County. This high

workload volume requires significant flexibility from our bench officers. Criminal Judges MaryAnne Majestic and Michelle O'Hair-Schattenberg, both with over 13 years tenure, have contributed greatly in addressing the high workload. Additionally, in March 2007, the Council approved an ordinance creating the position of Court Commissioner. We then reclassified an existing Hearing Officer position to Commissioner and Judge Thomas Robinson, who has been with the court since 1995, is now filling this position. While he still primarily hears civil violations, he is also covering our in-custody docket at least two days a week thus reducing our cost for pro-tems who traditionally cover this docket. He has also filled in for criminal division judges in their absence, again reducing costs. His ability to be available on a moment's notice has greatly increased our flexibility. Also, as a result of the retirement of one of our hearing officers this year, we added our first new bench officer in ten years, Judge Art Attona. I do think our stability at the bench level is a significant statement about our commitment to quality and justice.

As you are aware we are now at the beginning of the expanded City of Tempe Photo Enforcement Program. The initial numbers have indicated a vast increase in filings as more and more installations go live. We worked closely with the Police Department during the implementation stage of this program and quickly began to realize the enormous impact this would have on the court. Fortunately the Council was also able to recognize this and recently authorized five new Court Services Specialist positions for the Court to address this workload. This is most appreciated and we are confident that as a result we will be able to continue to provide the level of service Tempe customers have come to expect.

Our extensive use of automation is one of the reasons we are able to operate at such low staffing levels. This has resulted in our intense focus over the last few years on the development of our new Case Management System (CMS). While progress on this highly complex effort did not go as rapidly as we had hoped, we are diligently working our way towards a revised implementation date of September 2008. To ensure success we have assigned one of our Deputy Court Managers full-time to the job as Project Manager. Numerous demonstrations to internal staff and those in other courts have resulted in high praise for the thoroughness of the system. We continue to have every confidence that the end result will be a CMS that not only contains all of our current functionality but also markedly improves it. One already positive result of the

detailed development process has been the required review of every aspect of our work process. Thus, the new system will provide a solid platform for future enhancements that will streamline our work processes even more. Clearly the long-awaited implementation and the concurrent necessary training will be a big undertaking this year. We have worked in partnership with the Supreme Court's Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) throughout the development of our CMS. As a result it continues to be a candidate system for most limited jurisdiction courts throughout Arizona. Thus, we anticipate continued development and training support not only from the AOC but other limited jurisdiction courts as well.

As many are now experiencing downtown, the always difficult parking situation has been exacerbated by additional construction projects; particularly the closing of the East Parking lot at City Hall. We are approaching this problem from a variety of angles. We have been working with the prosecutor's office to find solutions that would keep some groups of defendants from having to come to Court prior to their assignment to diversion. We have accommodated Tempe citizens volunteering their time as jurors by allowing them access to the Police/Court parking garage. While some of these issues will hopefully be addressed by the completion of the parking garage in a year's time, we still face challenges for our employees. Because of the nature of our business, many have concerns about lengthy walks to off-site parking that result in exposure to disgruntled customers. I would welcome the opportunity to help develop a long term parking plan that not only accommodates court users but also court employees.

Most exciting for me this year has been my new management team. This year marked the completion of the first year with a new Court Manager, Mark Stodola, as well as a new Deputy Court Manager, Nancy Rodriguez. As I mentioned, we also assigned our other Deputy Court Manager, Rick Rager, full-time as Project Manager for the Case Management System and thus I have also had a Court Supervisor, Jeanette Wiesenhofer, on temporary assignment as Deputy Court Manager for the Criminal Division. Additionally, Court Supervisors, Christy Slover, Jennifer Dubois, Alexis Allen and Jacque Frusetta have consistently gone the extra mile in training new hires, assuring exceptional customer service and fulfilling the court's mission. I can say unequivocally that this is the best management team I have ever had. Their vision and support make everything we do possible and I cannot thank them enough.

## CONCLUSION

I continue to be proud of the entire staff here at the Court and the constant teamwork and commitment they demonstrate. It is their efforts that make the list of accomplishments possible. I look forward to another year as we accomplish the goals and meet the challenges ahead.

As always we consistently receive excellent support and assistance from departments throughout the city. I particularly appreciate the partnership within the Criminal Justice Working Group and the efforts of the Human Resources Department who have provided so much support through our personnel changes and reclassifications. And, of course, the Information Technology Department is a key player in our CMS project. The commitment of Mayor and Council to excellence throughout the organization is a source of pride for all of us.

We will continue to always strive toward our goal to provide a stable and progressive Court that serves this community by providing effective and efficient administration of justice. We all appreciate the opportunity to serve Tempe.



## **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment # 1 – Court Mission and Vision Statement  
Attachment # 2 - 2008 Goals  
Attachment # 3 – Maricopa County Municipal Courts Activity Statistics  
Attachment # 4 – Workload Indicators, Criminal and Civil Divisions  
Attachment # 5 – Budget Summary  
Attachment # 6 – Revenue Summary  
Attachment # 7 – Three-year Information Technology Financial Summary  
Attachment # 8 – Security Statistics

## **COURT MANAGEMENT TEAM**

Mark Stodola, *Court Manager*  
Rick Rager, *Deputy Court Manager, Automation Manager*  
Nancy Rodriguez, *Deputy Court Manager, Civil Division, Budget Manager*  
Christy Slover, *Court Services Supervisor, Court Services, Criminal Division*  
Jennifer Dubois, *Financial Services Supervisor, Civil Division*  
Jacque Frusetta, *Administrative Services Supervisor, Court Administration*  
Alexis Allen, *Court Services Supervisor, Civil Division*  
Frankie Valenzuela, *Court Training Coordinator*  
Jeanette Wiesenhofer, *Court Services Supervisor, Criminal Division*

## **INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION**

Mayor and City Council  
Charlie Meyer, *City Manager*  
Jeff Kulaga, *Assistant City Manager*  
Andrew Ching, *City Attorney*  
Robert Hubbard, *City Prosecutor*  
Jan Hort, *City Clerk*  
Tom Ryff, *Chief of Police*  
Angel Carbajal, *Assistant Chief of Police*  
Brenda Buren, *Assistant Chief of Police*  
Mary Anders, *Fiscal/Research Administrator*  
Kerby Rapp, *Operations Support Administrator*  
Jon O'Connor, *Deputy Human Resources Manager*  
Tom Canasi, *Community Services Manager*  
Kathy Berzins, *Deputy Community Services Manager, Social Services*  
Shelley Hearn, *Community Relations Manager*  
Nikki Ripley, *Communication and Media Relations Director*  
Jerry Hart, *Financial Services Manager*  
Cecilia Velasco-Robles, *Deputy Financial Services Manager, Budget*  
Tom Mikesell, *Lead Budget and Research Analyst*  
Adam Williams, *Budget and Research Analyst II*  
Mark Day, *Budget and Research Analyst II*  
Gene Obis, *Information Technology Manager*  
Dave Heck, *Deputy Information Technology Manager*  
Ted Hoffman, *Deputy Information Technology Manager*  
Ron Smith, *Applications Supervisor*

## **JUDICIAL ADVISORY BOARD**

Judy Aldrich  
Thomas E. Klobas  
Brad Tebow  
Hon. Mark Aceto  
Margaret Stockton

## **EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION**

Barbara Mundell, *Presiding Judge, Superior Court, Maricopa County*  
Marcus Reinkensmeyer, *Court Administrator, Maricopa County*  
Karen Westover, *Court Administrator, Limited Jurisdictions Courts, Maricopa County*  
David K. Byers, *Administrative Director, AOC, Supreme Court*  
Janet Scheiderer, *Court Services Director, AOC, Supreme Court*

## MISSION

To contribute to the quality of life in our community by fairly and impartially administering justice in the most effective, efficient, and professional manner possible.

## VISION

Work together to serve the public.

Treat the public and each other with courtesy and respect.

Be ethical in all that we do.

Communicate honestly and openly.

Be sensitive and caring.

Welcome and value individual differences and diversity.

Reward well-intentioned and well-reasoned risk taking.

Praise and reward fully, discipline sparingly.

Be energetic and hard working.

Make every day in the Court both positive and productive.

## **2008 GOALS**

### **Case Management System (CMS) Implementation**

The Court is in latter stages of a Case Management System development in partnership with the Arizona Supreme Court. \$500,000 in state funds has been provided toward this effort, which uses a robust and current technology set. Implementation in the Court is planned for September 2008. The City IT Department is responsible for the data migration from the Court's current Legacy application to the new application. This CMS project is a candidate to become the next generation system for all limited jurisdiction courts in Arizona.

### **Processing of Photo Enforcement Complaints**

The City of Tempe recently entered into a contract that will increase the number of photo enforcement cases filed with the Court by up to 600 percent. This will result in a significant increase in judicial and staff workload. The judicial workload increase will involve a higher volume of civil traffic hearings to adjudicate responsibility. The staff workload increase will include processing payments, correspondence, telephone inquiries and defensive driving completion reports. The Court will continue to place a high priority on the timely and accurate processing of all cases, including this increased caseload.

### **Disaster Preparedness**

The Court plans to further enhance its already comprehensive disaster preparedness and business continuity plan by exploring the purchase of fireproof cabinets to protect original complaints and fingerprint records for cases that the Court is required to maintain and preserve, providing flash-drives to management staff that contain all written policies, procedures and form templates for use in case of an emergency in which staff cannot access the physical facility and by continuing to implement unannounced drills to test manual work-around procedures. Tempe is assisting other courts in the development of disaster preparedness plans.

### **Customer Service**

In efforts to continue our quest to emphasize positive interaction with both internal and external customers we will continue to offer the public customer satisfaction surveys as one way to measure our service. In addition, we have developed in-house classes such as Legal Advice vs. Legal Information and Basic Spanish for Court Employees that will offer staff resources to better serve our customers. Lastly, we will continue to discuss in monthly team meetings and training e-mails the importance of quality customer service to both the public and to internal customers.

### **Training**

The Court continues to explore ways to maximize the potential of court staff. With the help of our court training coordinator, we have established new in-house training classes and have outside training classes available for staff development. In addition, we will use e-learning to help train employees as a fast low cost-method of learning. This year will also be spent working on creating training manuals for our new case management system and developing "hands-on" training sessions for staff.

## **Stability of the Court Workforce**

Over the past three years the Court has experienced tremendous turnover from its front line staff resulting in instability throughout the court. Management has made it a priority to address this turnover by advocating for additional staff, addressing workload issues, providing more hands-on training for new hires, establishing a morale committee and emphasizing employee accountability. While the Court has experienced a 33 percent turnover rate of Court Service Specialists, we have dropped below a 5 percent turnover in the first 6 months of Fiscal Year 2008.

## **Employee Accountability**

The Court is examining ways to better measure employee and Court performance through the use of CourTools. CourTools is a set of ten trial court performance measures developed by the National Center for State Courts that offers court managers a balanced perspective on court operations.

## **MARICOPA COUNTY MUNICIPAL COURT ACTIVITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006/2007**

Comparing various workloads, output and productivity measures of selected municipal courts in Maricopa County support findings of previous external operational reviews and financial audits. Benchmark figures are attached to allow for further analysis. Certain objective measures are key indicators of efficiency. For example:

- Tempe Municipal Court ranks fourth in Maricopa County in terms of filings (behind, Phoenix, Mesa and Scottsdale).
- Tempe Municipal Court is the fifth largest municipal court in the state (after Phoenix, Tucson, Scottsdale and Mesa) in terms of filings, yet is the ninth largest city in the state.
- Tempe Municipal Courts filings account for approximately 10.08 percent of the total municipal court filings in Maricopa County.
- Tempe Municipal Court has the second highest ratio of revenue to expenditures; \$2.54:1 (\$2.54 in revenue for every \$1.00 spent for court operations).
- Tempe Municipal Court has the second lowest cost per filing of comparable municipal courts (\$44 per filing) in Maricopa County (\$62).
- The Tempe Municipal Court has the highest filings per judge in Maricopa County
- There were 24,945 filings per bench officer and 3,898 filings per non-judicial staff in FY 07.
- Tempe Municipal Court has the second highest ratio of revenue to expenditures; 2.32:1 (\$2.32 in revenue for every \$1.00 spent for court operations).
- Tempe Municipal Court has the second lowest cost per filing of comparable courts (\$40 per filing) in Maricopa County (average of \$61 per filing).
- Tempe Municipal Court continues to have slightly lower revenues per filing than most other courts, due in large part to the number of parking violations, which constitute some of the lowest assessed fine amounts.

## MARICOPA COUNTY MUNICIPAL COURT ACTIVITY FY 2006/2007

### COURT FILINGS FY 2006/2007

	<u>CRIMINAL</u>				<u>PROTECTIVE</u>		<u>% TO</u>	
	<u>TRAFFIC</u>	<u>MISDEMEANOR</u>	<u>CIVIL TRAFFIC</u>	<u>ORDINANCE</u>	<u>ORDERS</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>COUNTY</u>	<u>% TO STATE</u>
GLENDALE	9,650	9,567	35,162	2,161	3,175	59,715	5.60%	3.84%
CHANDLER	5,817	7,019	25,488	1,885	1,062	41,271	3.87%	2.66%
MESA	18,170	18,595	96,347	3,012	2,010	138,134	12.94%	8.89%
TEMPE	11,373	13,988	56,485	25,014	658	107,518	10.08%	6.92%
SCOTTSDALE	14,734	9,161	180,621	4,658	1,154	210,328	19.71%	13.53%
PHOENIX	52,198	40,938	194,408	41,584	3,321	332,449	31.15%	21.39%
MARICOPA CO	133,022	117,185	717,992	84,540	14,378	1,067,117	100.00%	68.67%
STATE OF ARIZONA	179,625	242,080	967,557	143,530	21,263	1,554,055	100.00%	100.00%

### COURT REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES FY 2006/2007

	<u>REVENUE</u>	<u>EXPENDITURES</u>	<u>REVENUE PER</u>	<u>EXPENDITURE</u>	<u>\$ RATIO</u>
			<u>FILING</u>	<u>PER FILING</u>	<u>REVENUE TO</u>
					<u>EXPENDITURE</u>
CHANDLER	\$6,041,442	\$3,340,379	\$146	\$81	\$1.81:\$1
GLENDALE	\$6,916,442	\$4,667,438	\$116	\$78	\$1.48:\$1
TEMPE	\$11,945,389	\$4,705,583	\$111	\$44	\$2.54:\$1
SCOTTSDALE	\$23,682,042	\$5,959,223	\$113	\$28	\$3.97:\$1
MESA	\$15,765,302	\$6,665,944	\$114	\$48	\$2.37:\$1
PHOENIX	\$44,609,201	\$30,285,496	\$134	\$91	\$1.47:\$1
MARICOPA CO	\$132,018,938	\$66,024,146	\$124	\$62	\$2.00:\$1
STATE OF ARIZONA	\$181,210,933	\$94,384,062	\$117	\$60	\$1.92:\$1

### COURT STAFFING Staffing figures were obtained directly from the courts as this information has not yet been reported to the Supreme Court

	<u>JUDGES</u>	<u>HEARING</u>	<u>NON-JUDICIAL</u>	<u>FILINGS PER</u>	<u>FILINGS PER</u>	<u>FILINGS</u>	<u>FILINGS</u>
		<u>OFFICERS</u>	<u>STAFF</u>	<u>JUDGE</u>	<u>HEARING</u>	<u>PER BENCH</u>	<u>PER NON-</u>
					<u>OFFICER</u>	<u>OFFICER</u>	<u>JUDICIAL</u>
							<u>STAFF</u>
CHANDLER	4	1	42	3,209	27,373	8,254	983
GLENDALE	3	1	48	6,406	37,323	14,929	1,244
TEMPE	3	2	32.5	8,454	40,750	21,504	3,308
SCOTTSDALE	5	2	59	4,779	92,640	30,047	3,560
MESA	7	1	82.5	5,252	99,359	17,267	1,674
PHOENIX	22	4	348	4,233	58,998	12,787	955
MARICOPA CO.	not available	not available	not available	not available	not available	not available	not available
STATE OF ARIZONA	not available	not available	not available	not available	not available	not available	not available

# COURT TRIALS AND HEARINGS

	<u>NON -JURY</u> <u>TRIALS</u>	<u>JURY TRIALS</u>	<u>PROTECTIVE</u> <u>ORDER</u> <u>HEARINGS</u>	<u>CIVIL</u> <u>HEARINGS</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>TRIALS /</u> <u>HEARINGS</u>	<u>%</u> <u>FILINGS</u> <u>THAT GO</u> <u>TO TRIAL</u>	<u>% FILINGS</u> <u>THAT GO</u> <u>TO CIVIL</u> <u>HEARING</u>	<u>% FILINGS</u> <u>THAT GO TO</u> <u>TRIAL OR</u> <u>HEARING</u>
CHANDLER	1,106	25	289	1,699	3,119	8.81%	6.67%	7.56%
GLENDALE	69	11	292	304	676	0.42%	0.86%	1.13%
TEMPE	223	5	139	1,977	2,344	0.90%	3.50%	2.18%
SCOTTSDALE	250	48	175	2,557	3,030	1.25%	1.42%	1.44%
MESA	638	61	303	1,763	2,913	1.90%	1.83%	2.11%
PHOENIX	1,036	455	720	3,791	6,002	1.60%	1.95%	1.81%
MARICOPA CO	3,612	720	2,361	14,975	21,668	1.73%	2.09%	2.03%
STATE OF ARIZONA	4,865	887	3,327	19,709	28,788	1.36%	2.04%	1.85%

**NOTES:** This information is provided to the Supreme Court in accordance with annual reporting requirements.  
The 6 courts listed above represent 83.3% of the caseload in Maricopa County and 57.23% of the State of Arizona  
Court staffing totals for Maricopa County and the State of Arizona not available as of 1/09/08.

TEMPE MUNICIPAL COURT  
CIVIL DIVISION  
WORKLOAD INDICATORS  
FY 2006-2007

Activity	YTD	Avg/Mo	06/07 Proj	05/06 Tot	% Chg
Cases Filed	56,304	4,692	56,304	80,259	-30%
Charges Filed	69,894	5,825	69,894	98,927	-29%
Parking	23,777	1,981	23,777	43,035	-45%
Traffic & Misc.	39,590	3,299	39,590	45,919	-14%
Photo Radar	7,414	618	7,414	9,927	-25%
Speeding	6,924	577	6,924	9,202	-25%
Red Light	487	41	487	724	-33%
Arraignments	2,304	192	2,304	5,225	-56%
Courtroom 5	1,329	111	1,329	3,073	-57%
Final Adjudication	837	70	837	2,012	-58%
Courtroom 6	975	81	975	2,152	-55%
Final Adjudication	825	69	825	1,798	-54%
Motions	3,083	257	3,083	3,768	-18%
Courtroom 5	1,999	167	1,999	2,092	-4%
Courtroom 6	1,084	90	1,084	1,676	-35%
Hearings	1,977	165	1,977	2,653	-25%
Courtroom 5	957	80	957	1,240	-23%
Courtroom 6	1,020	85	1,020	1,413	-28%
FTA Defaults	19,670	1,639	19,670	22,707	-13%
Appeals	34	3	34	21	62%
Civil Correspondence Rec'd	30,255	2,521	30,255	48,596	-38%
Returned Mail	6,834	570	6,834	7,042	-3%
DDS Completions	8,869	739	8,869	10,873	-18%
AZDDS	3,848	321	3,848	6,475	-41%
CRASH	5,020	418	5,020	n/a	N/A
NSC	1	0	1	4,398	-100%
DDS Continuances	2,053	171	2,053	2,762	-26%
AZDDS	627	52	627	1,156	-46%
CRASH	1,426	119	1,426	n/a	N/A
NSC	0	0	0	1,607	-100%
Bicycle Diversion Completions	209	17	209	86	143%
Summons and Complaints	14,144	1,179	14,144	19,776	-28%
Complaints Issued	11,736	978	11,736	19,963	-41%
Complaints Reissued	2,408	201	2,408	319	655%
Cashier Activity	34,344	2,862	34,344	39,959	-14%
Mail Payments Posted	10,276	856	10,276	15,669	-34%
Financial Services Interviews	10,709	892	10,709	10,718	0%
IVR Payments	19,933	1,661	19,933	17,993	11%
Lockbox Payments	9,955	830	9,955	19,584	-49%



TEMPE MUNICIPAL COURT  
CRIMINAL DIVISION  
WORKLOAD INDICATORS  
FY 2006/2007

ACTIVITY	YTD	Avg/Mo	06/07 Proj	05-06 Tot	% Chg
CASES FILED	16,855	1,405	16,855	16,970	-1%
CHARGES FILED	38,924	3,244	38,924	38,687	1%
PRISONERS	9,559	797	9,559	9,394	2%
COURTROOM #4 ACTIVITY	7,882	657	7,882	7,814	1%
JAIL ACTIVITY	1,677	140	1,677	1,580	6%
INITIAL APPEARANCES (jail)	7,662	639	7,662	3,852	99%
ARRAIGNMENTS	9,227	769	9,227	4,968	86%
FINAL ADJUDICATION	2,474	206	2,474	1,487	66%
PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCES	12,084	1,007	12,084	6,108	98%
TRIALS	230	19	230	94	145%
NON-JURY	225	19	225	94	139%
JURY	5	0	5	8	-38%
PETITIONS FILED	538	45	538	386	39%
ORDER OF PROTECTION	375	31	375	252	49%
INJUNCTION PROHIBITING	163	14	163	134	22%
OTHER COURTROOM ACTIVITY*	4,993	416	4,993	1,906	162%
CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED	26,552	2,213	26,552	25,827	3%
RETURNED MAIL	6,149	512	6,149	3,640	69%
CERTIFIED MAIL	228	19	228	4,851	-95%
MOTIONS	22,015	1,835	22,015	22,576	-2%
MTC STATE	2,563	214	2,563	3,230	-21%
MTC DEFENSE	2,887	241	2,887	3,416	-15%
MTC PRO PER	4,775	398	4,775	5,110	-7%
MTC PUB DEF	863	72	863	704	23%
MTD STATE	9,737	811	9,737	8,664	12%
MTD DEFENSE	131	11	131	134	-2%
MTD PRO PER	31	3	31	46	-33%
MTD PUB DEF	10	1	10	2	400%
OTHER MOTIONS	1,018	85	1,018	2,259	-55%
WARRANTS ISSUED	12,354	1,030	12,354	10,158	22%
APPEALS	36	3	36	32	13%

CONSOLIDATED EXPENDITURES FOR ALL COST CENTERS  
FY 2006/2007

**PROJECTIONS**

ACCT #	ACCT DESC	1410	1411	1412	1400 ROLLUP	06/07 BUDGET	+ / - BUDGET
6201	OFFICE SUPPLIES	1,625.04	6,534.84	5,104.68	13,264.56	\$ 14,300.00	1,035.44
6305	CLOTHING	369.99	-	-	369.99	600.00	230.01
6351	MINOR EQUIPMENT	351.03	-	-	351.03	500.00	148.97
6370	PRINTING & COPY	571.87	8,075.94	8,804.64	17,452.45	18,000.00	547.55
6505	BOOKS & PUBLICATIONS	3,789.34	-	-	3,789.34	3,500.00	(289.34)
6513	FIRST AID	-	-	-	-	190.00	190.00
6514	AWARDS	1,117.87	-	-	1,117.87	1,000.00	(117.87)
6599	MISCELLANEOUS	670.90	-	-	670.90	1,000.00	329.10
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>MATERIALS &amp; SUPPLIES</b>	<b>8,496.04</b>	<b>14,610.78</b>	<b>13,909.32</b>	<b>37,016.14</b>	<b>39,090.00</b>	<b>2,073.86</b>
6656	CONSULTANTS -- Interpreters	-	2,962.20	1,125.00	4,087.20	7,493.00	3,405.80
6665	JURY FEES	-	12,372.91	-	12,372.91	15,981.00	3,608.09
6668	LEGAL FEES -- Pro Tems	109,801.00	-	-	109,801.00	110,000.00	199.00
6669	COLLECTION FEES	-	-	3,256.10	3,256.10	3,250.00	(6.10)
6670	PUBLIC DEFENDER FEES	205,492.00	-	-	205,492.00	180,000.00	(25,492.00)
6672	CONTRACTED SERVICES	-	1,888.80	-	1,888.80	2,566.00	677.20
6688	OFF-SITE STORAGE	1,054.57	-	-	1,054.57	1,129.00	74.43
6693	LAUNDRY	86.98	-	-	86.98	300.00	213.02
6694	INTERPRETERS	-	5,942.92	1,764.00	7,706.92	9,300.00	1,593.08
6701	CELL PHONE CHARGES	-	-	-	-	-	0.00
6702	TELECOMMUNICATION SVCS-Pagers	820.51	-	-	820.51	650.00	(170.51)
6704	POSTAGE	14.40	-	-	14.40	125.00	110.60
6716	MEMBERSHIP & SUBSCRIPTION	5,216.24	-	-	5,216.24	4,069.00	(1,147.24)
6753	OUTSIDE PRINTING	188.01	4,740.91	1,739.16	6,668.08	12,200.00	5,531.92
6755	DUPLICATING	-	1,548.43	877.78	2,426.21	3,500.00	1,073.79
6856	EQUIPMENT REPAIR	312.99	-	487.20	800.19	2,500.00	1,699.81
6906	EQUIPMENT RENTAL	-	8,404.80	2,852.81	11,257.61	11,500.00	242.39
6990	LICENSES	-	-	-	-	-	0.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>FEES &amp; SERVICES</b>	<b>322,986.70</b>	<b>37,860.97</b>	<b>12,102.05</b>	<b>372,949.72</b>	<b>364,563.00</b>	<b>(8,386.72)</b>
7401	TRAINING & SEMINAR	7,063.09	-	-	7,063.09	3,370.00	(3,693.09)
7403	TRAVEL EXPENSES	8,231.93	-	-	8,231.93	6,246.00	(1,985.93)
7404	LOCAL MEETINGS	1,161.80	-	-	1,161.80	\$ 760.00	(401.80)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>TRAINING &amp; SEMINAR</b>	<b>16,456.82</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>16,456.82</b>	<b>10,376.00</b>	<b>(6,080.82)</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>TOTAL BY COST CENTER</b>	<b>347,939.56</b>	<b>52,471.75</b>	<b>26,011.37</b>	<b>426,422.68</b>	<b>414,029.00</b>	<b>(12,393.68)</b>

OVER /  
UNDER BGT **\$12,393.68**

TEMPE MUNICIPAL COURT  
REVENUE SUMMARY  
FISCAL YEAR 2006-2007

ACCT # AND DESCRIPTION	PRIOR FY ACTUAL	CURRENT YTD REVENUES	% PROJ VS PFYA	DIFFERENCE (CFYP - PFYA)
4601 PARKING FINES	631,904.05	376,929.35	(0.40)	(254,974.70)
4602 TRAFFIC FINES	1,677,450.81	1,637,258.51	(0.02)	(40,192.30)
4603 CRIMINAL FINES	1,147,472.62	1,206,677.57	0.05	59,204.95
4604 PUBLIC DEFENDER FEES	61,337.59	83,389.73	0.36	22,052.14
4605 FORFEITURES	176,291.35	226,975.75	0.29	50,684.40
4607 NEIGHBORHOOD ENHANCEMENT	32,524.00	53,747.81	0.65	21,223.81
4609 ANIMAL CONTROL	-	-	0.00	0.00
4612 DDS COURT DIVERSION	450,804.00	490,666.90	0.09	39,862.90
4616 SMOKING ORDINANCE FINES	-	30.00	0.00	30.00
4617 DDS OUT OF STATE DIVERSION	2,430.00	1,623.00	(0.33)	(807.00)
4621 DEFAULT FEES	373,370.66	404,810.99	0.08	31,440.33
4624 BOOT FEES / PARKING	1,520.00	3,680.00	1.42	2,160.00
4627 COUNTY JAIL FEE	275,082.31	387,463.97	0.41	112,381.66
4628 COPIES AND TAPES	29,661.49	19,004.45	(0.36)	(10,657.04)
4636 PROCESS SERVICE	10,366.72	10,052.50	(0.03)	(314.22)
4640 SURETY BOND FORFEITURES	10,600.00	5,400.00	(0.49)	(5,200.00)
4642 REINSPECTION FEE/NBR ENH	-	-	0.00	0.00
4643 RENTAL HOUSING CODE FINE	50.00	250.00	4.00	200.00
4648 CONTEMPT CHARGES	100.00	300.00	2.00	200.00
4653 CITY JAIL FEE	86,355.00	145,190.50	0.68	58,835.50
4660 WARRANT FEES		48,025.09	0.00	0.00
4661 PROSECUTOR FEES		149,621.25	0.00	0.00
4935 CASH OVER / SHORT	5,960.95	(246.03)	(1.04)	(6,206.98)
4949 OTHER	(824.40)	29,331.14	(36.58)	30,155.54
TOTAL	4,967,320.60	5,053,451.03	0.02	86,130.43
ACCT # AND DESCRIPTION	PRIOR FY ACTUAL	CURRENT YTD REVENUES	% PROJ VS ACT	DIFFERENCE (CFYP - PFYA)
4641 PUBLIC SAFETY ENHANCEMENT FUND	449,070.98	394,634.22		
4634 28-2533 20% TO PD (Cost Center 2210)		387.22		
4637 28-4139 100% TO GENERAL FUND		127,071.89		
ACCT # AND DESCRIPTION	CURRENT FY PROJECTED	CURRENT YTD REVENUES	% PROJ VS ACT	DIFFERENCE (CFYP - PFYA)
4632 COURT USER FEE (CEF)	455,049.83	327,675.86	(0.28)	(127,373.97)
4851 INTEREST ACCRUED	15,051.07	29,219.60	0.94	14,168.53
4853 GAIN / LOSS ON INVESTMENT			0.00	0.00
TOTAL	470,100.90	356,895.46	(0.24)	(113,205.44)

Three-Year Information Technology Financial Summary

<b>Revenues:</b>	<b>FY2007/2008</b>	<b>FY2008/2009</b>	<b>FY2009/2010</b>
Balance Carryover:	\$ 561,533	\$ 24,566	\$ 2,066
Projected Revenues:	\$ 374,328	\$ 385,000	\$ 385,000
<b>Sub Total:</b>	<b>\$ 935,861</b>	<b>\$ 409,566</b>	<b>\$ 387,066</b>
<b>EXPENDITURES:</b>	<b>FY2007/2008</b>	<b>FY2008/2009</b>	<b>FY2009/2010</b>
FY 08 Expenditures through 12/31/07	\$ 376,595		
Case Management System Development - Programming	\$ 350,000	\$ 130,000	\$ 75,000
Case Management System Development System - Hardware	\$ 100,000		
Case Management System Development System - Software	\$ 50,000	\$ 23,000	\$ 25,000
IVR Maintenance Agreement, Annual Costs	\$ 8,000		
MiniSoft ODBC Maintenance, Annual Costs	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000
TAB Maintenance Agreement, Annual Costs	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500
InFax Calendar Display Maintenance, Annual Cost beg. 07/08		\$ 10,000	\$ 12,000
Police Radios for Panic Alarms, Annual Costs	\$ 13,700		
WENDELL Connection to Supreme Court T1 Line, Annual Costs	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000
HP LaserJet 430N	\$ 2,500		
E-government for Court			\$ 45,000
Check payments by telephone			\$ 20,000
Electronic TF of Funds for those on contracts			\$ 20,000
Document Imaging integrated w/case mgmt system			\$ 25,000
E-Filing of Court documents		\$ 15,000	
Video Conference system w/jail for IA, Arrn, etc.		\$ 20,000	
Fingerprint Scanners for Crim. Divisions, Imaging Proj.		\$ 25,000	
Federal Tax Intercept Program Interface			\$ 35,000
Appeals, electronic interface w/Superior Court			\$ 20,000
Civil Traffic arraignments via Internet			\$ 25,000
Filing Cabinets		\$ 22,000	
CEDP Training	\$ 3,000		
Security Cameras		\$ 25,000	
First Floor Build Out/Remodel		\$ 50,000	
Bar Coding			\$ 20,000
Database License/Maintenance		\$ 80,000	\$ 40,000
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES:</b>	<b>\$ 911,295</b>	<b>\$ 407,500</b>	<b>\$ 369,500</b>
<b>TOTAL REVENUES:</b>	<b>\$ 935,861</b>	<b>\$ 409,566</b>	<b>\$ 387,066</b>
<b>BALANCE:</b>	<b>\$ 24,566</b>	<b>\$ 2,066</b>	<b>\$ 17,566</b>

TEMPE MUNICIPAL COURT  
Single Point of Entry  
Security Statistics  
Fiscal Year 2007

DATE	MACE	KNIVES	RAZOR BLADE	TOOLS	CAN OPENER	BOX CUTTER	SCISSORS	NAIL FILES	GUNS	HAND CUFFS/ KEYS	NEEDLES	CHAINS	PICKS	AMMO	MAGS	MISC. ITEMS	TOTAL ITEMS	COUNTS	
																		PERSON S	ALARM
JUL	17	170	5	92	0	36	30	5	0	13	0	10	0	0	0	45	423	13230	7742
AUG	17	210	18	81	0	24	30	1	0	23	0	15	0	0	0	48	467	15367	11918
SEPT	21	193	8	89	0	16	17	1	0	14	0	25	0	0	0	43	427	13758	10658
OCT	23	207	8	103	0	27	26	2	2	13	8	15	0	0	0	72	506	14420	11110
NOV	14	173	12	103	0	21	26	4	1	14	0	15	0	0	0	53		12942	10051
DEC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	398	12790	10303
JAN	17	223	51	55	0	24	12	0	0	17	0	16	0	0	0	56	471	14591	12145
FEB	17	195	7	61	0	28	24	1	1	20	0	25	0	0	0	54	433	12844	10285
MARCH	21	196	13	66	0	11	10	1	0	18	0	16	0	0	0	46	398	13642	10362
APRIL	21	194	19	48	1	21	21	0	2	15	12	19	0	0	0	53	426	13003	10147
MAY	12	169	5	55	0	32	14	0	0	8	0	12	1	0	0	30	338	13184	10427
JUNE	19	143	10	61	1	28	18	1	0	11	0	9	0	0	0	21	322	12757	9804
TOTALS	199	2073	156	814	2	268	228	16	6	166	20	177	1	0	0	521	4609	162,528	124,952
AVG/MO	17	173	13	68	0	22	19	1	1	14	2	15	0	0	0	43	384	13544	10413
05-06 TOTAL	202	2,282	254	1,068	8	314	311	76	2	146	5	134	3	17	2	672	5,469	172,830	99,915